

ON q -DEFORMED QUANTUM STOCHASTIC CALCULUS

PIOTR ŚNIADY

ABSTRACT. In this paper we investigate a quantum stochastic calculus build of creation, annihilation and number of particles operators which fulfill some deformed commutation relations.

Namely, we introduce a deformation of a number of particles operator which has simple commutation relations with well known q -deformed creation and annihilation operators. Since all operators considered in this theory are bounded we do not deal with some difficulties of a non deformed theory of Hudson and Parthasarathy [HuP]. We define stochastic integrals and estimate them in the operator norm. We prove Itô's formula as well.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to construct a quantum stochastic calculus in which all operators are bounded and which would unify classical examples we mention below.

1.1. Classical examples of quantum stochastic calculi. The fundamental observation which inspired the development of Hudson–Parthasarathy stochastic calculus [HuP] was that a family of commuting selfadjoint operators and a state τ induce (by the spectral theorem) measures which can be interpreted as joint distributions of a certain stochastic process.

The most important examples are $B(t) = A(t) + A^*(t)$ which corresponds to the Brownian motion and $P_l(t) = \sqrt{l} B(t) + \Lambda(t) + lt\mathbf{1}$ which correspond to the Poisson process with intensively l . $A(t), A^*(t), \Lambda(t)$ ($t \geq 0$) called annihilation, creation and gauge process have values being unbounded operators acting on some Hilbert space called bosonic Fock space.

For all $s, t \geq 0$ they fulfill the following commutation relations:

- (1) $[A(t), A(s)] = [A^*(t), A^*(s)] = 0,$
- (2) $[\Lambda(t), \Lambda(s)] = 0,$
- (3) $[A(t), A^*(s)] = \min(t, s)\mathbf{1},$
- (4) $[A(t), \Lambda(s)] = A[\min(t, s)],$
- (5) $[\Lambda(t), A^*(s)] = A^*[\min(t, s)].$

In the Fock space there exists a unital cyclic vector Ω such that $A(t)\Omega = 0$. The state τ is defined as follows:

$$\tau(S) = \langle \Omega, S\Omega \rangle.$$

Stochastic integrals with respect to the Brownian motion or Poisson process can therefore be written as integrals with respect to creation, annihilation and gauge processes. A stochastic calculus in which such integrals are considered was constructed by Hudson and Parthasarathy [HuP]. However the fact that operators

considered in this theory are unbounded causes serious technical problems. For example equations (1)–(5) can be treated only informally and has to be clarified in a more complicated way. Moreover, a product of two stochastic integrals (considered in Itô's formula) is not well-defined and has to be evaluated in the weak sense.

A second important example is a fermionic stochastic calculus [BSW1, BSW2] in which in equations (1)–(5) commutators were replaced by anticommutators.

The third group of examples is connected with free probability in which the notion of classical independence of random variables was replaced by a non commutative notion of freeness. Biane and Speicher [BiS] considered integrals with respect to the free Brownian motion what is a generalization of the Itô's integral. On the other hand the approach of Kümmerer and Speicher [KüS] is rather relate to the calculus of Hudson and Parthasarathy: a free Brownian motion is represented as a family of non commuting selfadjoint operators $B(t) = A(t) + A^*(t)$ ($t \geq 0$) where $A(t), A^*(t)$ fulfill only a relation

$$(6) \quad A(t)A^*(s) = \min(t, s)\mathbf{1},$$

for all $t, s \geq 0$ and a state τ is defined as $\tau(S) = \langle \Omega, S\Omega \rangle$ for a unital cyclic vector Ω such that $A(t)\Omega = 0$. Stochastic integrals are evaluated with respect to $A(t)$ and $A^*(t)$ separately.

1.2. Overview of this paper. In order to avoid problems of Hudson and Parthasarathy's theory we postulate that all operators considered in our stochastic calculus should be bounded. Therefore we shall replace commutation relations of Hudson–Parthasarathy's calculus by some deformed analogues.

We start with the q -deformed commutation relation which was postulated by Frisch and Bourret [FB]:

$$(7) \quad a(\phi)a^*(\psi) = qa^*(\psi)a(\phi) + \langle \phi, \psi \rangle,$$

for all $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is a Hilbert space, $a(\phi)$ called annihilation operator and its adjoint $a^*(\phi)$ called creation operator are operators acting on some Hilbert space $\Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$.

If in the equation (7) we take $q = 1$ we obtain bosonic commutation relation (3), for $q = -1$ we obtain fermionic anticommutation relation and for $q = 0$ we obtain free relation (6), therefore q -deformed commutation relation unifies these three basic cases.

In the section 2 we shall repeat Bożejko and Speicher's [BS1] construction of q -deformed Fock space $\Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$ and bounded operators $a(\phi)$, $a^*(\phi)$ which fulfill (7). Furthermore we construct a bounded operator λ_{μ} which acts on $\Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$ and is a deformation of Hudson–Parthasarathy gauge operator and an auxiliary operator $\gamma_{\mu} : \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$ which is a deformation of the identity. We show commutation relations fulfilled by these operators. It turns out that these commutation relations allows us to write any product of these operators in a special order which is a generalization of Wick or normal ordering.

In the section 3 we define stochastic integrals with respect to four basic processes: annihilation $A(t)$, creation $A^*(t)$, gauge $\Lambda_{\mu}(t)$ and time $T(t)$. Since in the non commutative probability the integrand does not commute with the increments of integrator, we have to decide if the integrand should be multiplied from the left or from the right by the integrator. In fact, we shall investigate even a more general case, namely after Speicher and Biane [BiS] we consider so called bioperators and

biprocesses, so that the increments of integrator are multiplied both from left and right by the integrand.

Just like in the classical theory we first define stochastic integrals of simple adapted biprocesses and then by some limit procedure we extend stochastic integrals to a more general class of biprocesses.

In the section 4 we show that (under certain assumptions) an integral of a stochastic process is again an integrable stochastic process and that such an iterated integral is continuous.

The section 5 is devoted to the central point of this paper, the Itô's formula, which can be viewed as an integration by parts.

2. DEFORMED CREATION, ANNIHILATION AND NUMBER OF PARTICLES OPERATORS

2.1. Fock space. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space with a scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Elements of $\mathcal{H}$ will be denoted by small Greek letters: $\phi, \psi, \dots$

We shall denote the standard scalar product on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{free}}$ and call it a free scalar product. $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ furnished with this scalar product will be denoted by $\mathcal{H}_{\text{free}}^{\otimes n}$. By $\Gamma_{\text{free}}(\mathcal{H})$ or simply Γ_{free} we shall denote the direct sum of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{free}}^{\otimes n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. The space $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 0}$ which appears in this sum is understood as a one dimensional space $\mathbb{C}\Omega$ for some unital vector Ω .

If $E : \mathcal{D}(E) \rightarrow \Gamma_{\text{free}}$ for $\mathcal{D}(E) \subseteq \Gamma_{\text{free}}$ is a (possibly unbounded) strictly positive operator, we can introduce a new scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_E = \langle \cdot, E \cdot \rangle_{\text{free}}$ and a Hilbert space $\Gamma_E(\mathcal{H})$ or simply Γ_E which is a completion of $\mathcal{D}(E)$ with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_E$. The norm in Γ_E will be denoted by $\| \cdot \|_E$.

We choose now a parameter of deformation $q \in (-1, 1)$ which will be fixed in this paper.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we introduce after Bożejko and Speicher [BS1] a q -deformed symmetrization operator $P^{(n)} : \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$, which is a generalization of a symmetrization (for $q = 1$) and antisymmetrization (for $q = -1$) operators:

$$P^{(n)}(\psi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_n) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} q^{\text{inv}(\sigma)} \psi_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_{\sigma(n)},$$

where $\text{inv}(\sigma) = \#\{(i, j) : i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, i < j, \sigma(i) > \sigma(j)\}$ is the number of inversions in permutation σ .

Theorem 2.1. $P^{(n)}$ is a strictly positive operator.

Proof. Proof can be found in [BS1]. □

By $P : \mathcal{D}(P) \rightarrow \Gamma_{\text{free}}$ ($\mathcal{D}(P) \subset \Gamma_{\text{free}}$) we shall denote a closure of the direct sum of $P^{(n)}$ and by Γ we shall denote Γ_P . Since it does not lead to confusions by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ we shall denote both the scalar product in $\mathcal{H}$ and the q -deformed scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_P$ in the Fock space Γ and by $\| \cdot \|$ both the norm in Γ and in $\mathcal{H}$. Elements of Fock space will be denoted by capital Greek letters: $\Phi, \Psi, \dots$

Since now $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ will denote the tensor power of $\mathcal{H}$ furnished with q -deformed scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$.

Let $\Pi_j : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes j}$ denote the orthogonal projection on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes j}$.

The state τ which plays the role of a noncommutative expectation value is defined as $\tau(X) = \langle \Omega, X\Omega \rangle$ for $X : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$.

2.2. Operators of creation and annihilation. For $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$ we define action of operators $a(\phi), a^*(\phi) : \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$ on simple tensors as follows:

$$(8) \quad a^*(\phi)(\psi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_n) = \phi \otimes \psi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_n,$$

$$(9) \quad a(\phi)(\psi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n q^{i-1} \langle \phi, \psi_i \rangle \psi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_{i-1} \otimes \psi_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_n,$$

2.3. Number of particles operators. Now we need to introduce a deformed analogue of number of particles operator known also as gauge operator or differential second quantization operator. We require for this deformation to be a bounded operator and to have simple commutation relations with $a(\phi)$ and $a^*(\phi)$.

For a bounded operator $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ we are looking for $\lambda(T) : \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$ which action on simple tensors is defined as:

$$\lambda(T)(\psi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n f(n) \psi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_{i-1} \otimes T(\psi_i) \otimes \psi_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_n.$$

Except the factor $f(n)$ this definition coincides with a non deformed gauge operator. This factor was added in order to make $\lambda(T)$ a bounded operator. As it will be proven in the lemma 2.3 it holds if and only if $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |f(n)|n < \infty$.

The choice of $f(n) = \mu^n$ for a complex number μ ($|\mu| < 1$) seems to be the easiest solution. Therefore we define

$$(10) \quad \lambda_{\mu}(T)(\psi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu^n \psi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_{i-1} \otimes T(\psi_i) \otimes \psi_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_n.$$

As we shall see in the section 2.4 in order to interchange the deformed number of particles operator with creation or annihilation operators we need to introduce for $|\mu| \leq 1$ an operator $\gamma_{\mu} : \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$ as follows:

$$(11) \quad \gamma_{\mu}(\psi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_n) = \mu^n \psi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_n.$$

This operator is a deformed identity operator and for $\mu = 1$ is equal to identity.

Theorem 2.2. For $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$, $|\mu| < 1$ and a bounded $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ operators $a(\phi), a^*(\phi), \lambda_{\mu}(T)$ and γ_{μ} are bounded and

$$\|\gamma_{\mu}\| = 1,$$

$$\|a(\phi)\| = \|a^*(\phi)\| \leq \frac{\|\phi\|}{\sqrt{1-|\mu|}},$$

$$\|\lambda_{\mu}(T)\| \leq \|T\| \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n |\mu|^n.$$

Operators $a^*(\phi)$ and $a(\phi)$ as defined in equations (8) and (9) are adjoint as the notation suggests. Furthermore we have

$$[\lambda_{\mu}(T)]^* = \lambda_{\bar{\mu}}(T^*)$$

$$\gamma_{\mu}^* = \gamma_{\bar{\mu}}$$

Proof. It is obvious that for $|\mu| \leq 1$ the operator γ_{μ} is a contraction.

The second inequality will be proven in a more general context in the section 3.3.

Since $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ are mutually orthogonal invariant spaces of $\lambda_\mu(T)$ from the lemma 2.3 follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\lambda_\mu(T)\|_{\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma} &= \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\lambda_\mu(T)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}} = \\ &= \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\lambda_\mu(T)\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{free}}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\text{free}}^{\otimes n}} \leq \|T\| \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n |\mu|^n. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of the fact that $a(\phi)$ and $a^*(\phi)$ are adjoint can be found in [BS1]. Proofs of the other two equations are straightforward. $\square$

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that $\mathcal{V}_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) are vector spaces. $\mathcal{V}_i$ furnished with a scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_i$ is a Hilbert space denoted by $\mathcal{K}_i$.*

If $P_i : \mathcal{K}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_i$ are strictly positive bounded operators we can furnish $\mathcal{V}_i$ with another scalar product $\langle \cdot, P_i \cdot \rangle_i$ and the resulting Hilbert spaces we shall denote by $\mathcal{K}'_i$.

Then operator norms of $S : \mathcal{K}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_2$ and $S : \mathcal{K}'_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{K}'_2$ are equal for every operator $S : \mathcal{V}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_2$ such that $SP_1 = P_2S$.

Proof. For any polynomial $f(x)$ we have $Sf(P_1) = f(P_2)S$ therefore approximating the square root by polynomials we obtain $S\sqrt{P_1} = \sqrt{P_2}S$. Note that for $v \in \mathcal{V}_1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Sv\|_{\mathcal{K}'_2} &= \|\sqrt{P_2}Sv\|_{\mathcal{K}_2} = \|S\sqrt{P_1}v\|_{\mathcal{K}_2} \leq \\ &\leq \|S\|_{\mathcal{K}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_2} \|\sqrt{P_1}v\|_{\mathcal{K}_1} = \|S\|_{\mathcal{K}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_2} \|v\|_{\mathcal{K}'_1}, \end{aligned}$$

therefore

$$\|S\|_{\mathcal{K}'_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{K}'_2} \leq \|S\|_{\mathcal{K}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_2}.$$

If in the preceding calculations we replace $\mathcal{K}_i$ by $\mathcal{K}'_i$ (and vice versa) and replace P_i by P_i^{-1} we obtain the opposite inequality. $\square$

2.4. Commutation relations.

Theorem 2.4. *For $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}$, a bounded operator $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ and $|\mu|, |\nu| < 1$ hold*

$$(12) \quad a(\phi)a^*(\psi) = qa^*(\psi)a(\phi) + \langle \phi, \psi \rangle,$$

$$(13) \quad a(\phi)\gamma_\mu = \mu\gamma_\mu a(\phi),$$

$$(14) \quad \gamma_\mu a^*(\phi) = \mu a^*(\phi)\gamma_\mu,$$

$$(15) \quad a(\phi)\lambda_\mu(T) = \mu\lambda_\mu(T)a(\phi) + \mu\gamma_\mu a(T^*\phi),$$

$$(16) \quad \lambda_\mu(T)a^*(\phi) = \mu a^*(\phi)\lambda_\mu(T) + \mu a^*(T\phi)\gamma_\mu,$$

$$(17) \quad \lambda_\mu(T)\gamma_\nu = \gamma_\mu\lambda_\nu(T) = \lambda_{\mu\nu}(T).$$

$$(18) \quad \gamma_\mu\gamma_\nu = \gamma_{\mu\nu}$$

If bounded operators $T_1, T_2 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ commute then

$$(19) \quad \lambda_\mu(T_1)\lambda_\nu(T_2) = \lambda_\nu(T_2)\lambda_\mu(T_1).$$

Proof. Proof is straightforward, we shall omit it. $\square$

Since γ_1 is equal to identity we see that in the limit $q, \mu \rightarrow 1$ relations (12), (15), (16) and (17) correspond to non deformed relations (3), (4), (5) and (2). Note that contrary to the non deformed case among these commutation relations there is none which would allow us to interchange the order of adjacent two creation or two annihilation operators.

2.5. Algebra $\mathcal{A}$. Suppose $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{K} \oplus \mathcal{K}^\perp$ and $\mathcal{K}^\perp$ is an infinite-dimensional, separable Hilbert space. We denote by $\mathcal{A}_{\text{fin}\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H})$ an algebra of bounded operators acting on $\mathcal{H}$ generated by operators $a(\phi)$, $a^*(\phi)$, γ_μ , $\lambda_\mu(T \oplus \mathbf{0})$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{K}$, $|\mu| < 1$ and bounded operators $T : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$. We shall denote by $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H})$ the completion of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{fin}\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H})$ in the operator norm.

2.6. Normal ordering. In algebras generated by (bosonic, fermionic or q -deformed) creation and annihilation operators one introduces normal or Wick's ordering where in each expression one writes creation operators on the right hand side and annihilation operators on the left hand side. Now we introduce an analogue of such ordering in algebras $\mathcal{A}_{\text{fin}}$.

Theorem 2.5. *Every element S of an algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\text{fin}}$ can be written as a finite sum of products of the following form: on the left hand side creation operators, some $\lambda_\nu(T)$ operators, a γ_μ operator (for some μ , $|\mu| \leq 1$) and on the right hand side annihilation operators.*

$$(20) \quad S = \sum_i a^*(\phi_{i1}) \cdots a^*(\phi_{in_i}) \lambda_{\nu_{i1}}(T_{i1}) \cdots \lambda_{\nu_{ik_i}}(T_{ik_i}) \gamma_{\mu_i} a(\psi_{i1}) \cdots a(\psi_{im_i}).$$

Proof. Note that an expression is in the mentioned form if and only if it does not contain any subexpression being the left hand side of one of equations (12)–(18). If it does not hold by replacing the left hand side of appropriate equation by the right hand side we obtain an expression (or a sum of expressions) which is either shorter or has the same length but smaller number of disorderings. We can easily see that this procedure has to stop after finite number of iterations. $\square$

By $\mathcal{A}^{(k,l)}$ we shall denote the completion of the space of operators that can be written in the normal ordering (20) with exactly k creation operators $a^*(\cdot)$ and l annihilation operators $a(\cdot)$. Let $\mathcal{A}^{(k,\cdot)} = \bigoplus_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A}^{(k,l)}$ and $\mathcal{A}^{(\cdot,l)} = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A}^{(k,l)}$.

For an integer number $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ we define $\mathcal{A}^{[n]}$ to be a completion of the space of operators that (not necessarily in the normal ordering) contain exactly n more creators than annihilators. $\mathcal{A}^{[n]} = \bigoplus_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}, k-l=n} \mathcal{A}^{(k,l)}$.

For $S \in \mathcal{A}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ let $S^{[n]} \in \mathcal{A}^{[n]}$ be a part of S which contains exactly n more creation than annihilation operators. More precisely, $S^{[n]} = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}: i \geq 0, i+n \geq 0} \Pi_{i+n} S \Pi_i$. Note that $\|S^{[n]}\| \leq \|S\|$ because

$$\|S^{[n]}\Psi\|^2 = \sum_i \|\Pi_{i+n} S \Pi_i \Psi\|^2 \leq \sum_i \|S \Pi_i \Psi\|^2 \leq \|S\|^2 \sum_i \|\Pi_i \Psi\|^2 = \|S\| \|\Psi\|^2.$$

2.7. Extension of operators.

Lemma 2.6. *If $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{K} \oplus \mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{K} \oplus \mathcal{L}_2$ where $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2$ are separable, infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces then there exists exactly one continuous $*$ -isomorphism V of Banach algebras $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ which maps operators $a(\phi), a^*(\phi), \lambda_\mu(T), \gamma_\mu \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ respectively on $a(\phi), a^*(\phi), \lambda_\mu(T), \gamma_\mu \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H}_2)$. Moreover, this $*$ -isomorphism is an isometry.*

Particularly, if $\mathcal{H}_1 \subset \mathcal{H}_2$ then this $*$ -isomorphism assigns to an operator $S \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ its extension $\tilde{S} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ (since it does not lead to confusions we shall often denote both operators by the same letter).

Proof. Let $U : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$ be an isometry such that U limited to $\mathcal{K}$ is equal to identity. Such isometry exists because $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ have the same dimension.

We define now an second quantization of U , i.e. an isometry $\Gamma(U) : \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}_1} \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}_2}$ by the formula $\Gamma(U)(\psi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_n) = U(\psi_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes U(\psi_n)$. The wanted $*$ -isomorphism is

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H}_1) \ni S \mapsto \Gamma(U)S\Gamma(U)^* \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H}_2).$$

The uniqueness of such isomorphism follows from the fact that it is uniquely defined on a dense subspace $\mathcal{A}_{\text{fin}}$ $\square$

The lemma remains true if in the formulation we skip the assumption of separability, the proof of this fact is however more complicated.

3. STOCHASTICAL INTEGRALS

Since we are interested in stochastic calculus, since now we have $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$. We also introduce notation $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, $\mathcal{H}_t = \mathcal{L}^2(0, t)$ and $\mathcal{A}_t = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}_t}$.

We shall investigate stochastic integrals with respect to four basic stochastic processes with values in algebra $\mathcal{A}$: annihilation $A(t) = a(\chi_{(0,t)})$, creation $A^*(t) = a^*(\chi_{(0,t)})$, gauge $\Lambda_\mu(t) = \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{(0,t)})$ and time $T(t) = t\mathbf{1}$, where $\chi_I \in \mathcal{H}$ denotes a characteristic function of a set $I \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\Pi_I : \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}_+) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(I)$ denotes the orthogonal projection.

3.1. Bioperators and biprocesses. If $S : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a measurable function we shall call it a process. If for almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have $S(t) \in \mathcal{A}_t$ we say it is adapted.

Elements of $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ will be called bioperators. A bioperator can be multiplied by an operator from left or right and the result is a bioperator: for $F, G, S \in \mathcal{A}$ we define $(F \otimes G)S = F \otimes (GS)$, $S(F \otimes G) = (SF) \otimes G$. Furthermore we define a “musical” product of a bioperator by an operator such that the result is an operator: $(F \otimes G)\sharp S = FSG$. We shall introduce a convolution: $(F \otimes G)^* = G^* \otimes F^*$.

If $R : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ is a measurable function we shall call it a biprocess. If for almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have $R(t) \in \mathcal{A}_t \otimes \mathcal{A}_t$ we say it is adapted, if for almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have $R(t) \in \mathcal{A}_t \otimes \mathcal{A}$ or $R(t) \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}_t$ we say that R is respectively left- or right-adapted.

A simple biprocess is a biprocess of the form $R(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \chi_{I_i}(t)$ where $B_i \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ and I_i are intervals.

3.2. Stochastic integral of a simple biprocess. A stochastic integral of a simple biprocess is defined as a Riemann sum

$$\int \left(\sum_{i=1}^n B_i \chi_{I_i}(t) \right) \sharp dS = \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \sharp [S(s_i) - S(t_i)],$$

where $I_i = (s_i, t_i)$.

3.3. Stochastic integrals with respect to the creation and annihilation process.

3.3.1. *Tensor product* $\otimes_k$. For $\phi, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{H}$ we define a tensor product $\otimes_k$ as

$$\phi \otimes_k (\psi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_n) = \begin{cases} \psi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_k \otimes \phi \otimes \psi_{k+1} \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_n & : k \leq n \\ 0 & : k > n \end{cases}$$

and an operator $\mathbf{1} \otimes_k P^{(n)} : \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(n+1)} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(n+1)}$ which for $n \geq k$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} & [\mathbf{1} \otimes_k P^{(n)}](\psi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_k \otimes \phi \otimes \psi_{k+1} \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_n) = \\ & = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} q^{\text{inv}(\sigma)} \psi_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_{\sigma(k)} \otimes \phi \otimes \psi_{\sigma(k+1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_{\sigma(n)} \end{aligned}$$

and is a modification of q -deformed symmetrization operator, which does not move the factor on the $k+1$ position. For $n < k$ we take $\mathbf{1} \otimes_k P^{(n)} = 0$.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a positive constant $\omega(q)$ such that for each n we have*

$$P^{(n+1)} \leq \frac{1}{1-|q|} \mathbf{1} \otimes P^{(n)},$$

$$\mathbf{1} \otimes P^{(n)} \leq \frac{1}{\omega(q)} P^{(n+1)}.$$

There exist positive constants $c_{k,q}, d_{k,q}$ such that for each $n \geq k$ we have

$$P^{(n+1)} \leq c_{k,q} \mathbf{1} \otimes_k P^{(n)},$$

$$\mathbf{1} \otimes_k P^{(n)} \leq d_{k,q} P^{(n+1)}.$$

Proof. Proof of the first two inequalities can be found in [Bož]. Now we show the third one.

$$\begin{aligned} P^{(n+1)} & \leq \frac{1}{1-|q|} \mathbf{1} \otimes P^{(n)} \leq \dots \leq \frac{1}{(1-|q|)^{k+1}} \mathbf{1}^{\otimes(k+1)} \otimes P^{(n-k)} = \\ & = \frac{1}{(1-|q|)^{k+1}} \mathbf{1} \otimes_k [\mathbf{1}^{\otimes k} \otimes P^{(n-k)}] \leq \\ & \leq \frac{\omega(q)}{(1-|q|)^{k+1}} \mathbf{1} \otimes_k [\mathbf{1}^{\otimes(k-1)} \otimes P^{(n-k+1)}] \leq \dots \leq \frac{\omega(q)^{k-1}}{(1-|q|)^{k+1}} \mathbf{1} \otimes_k P^{(n)} \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality can be proven similarly. $\square$

Corollary 3.2. *For any $\Psi \in \Gamma$ holds*

$$\|\Psi\|_{\mathbf{1} \otimes_k P} \leq \sqrt{d_{k,q}} \|\Psi\|.$$

If furthermore $\Psi \in \bigoplus_{n>k} \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ then

$$\|\Psi\| \leq \sqrt{c_{k,q}} \|\Psi\|_{\mathbf{1} \otimes_k P}.$$

For every $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$\|a(\phi)\| = \|a^*(\phi)\| \leq \frac{\|\phi\|}{\sqrt{1-|q|}}.$$

Proof. The last inequality holds since for each $\Psi \in \Gamma$ we have

$$\|a^*(\phi)\Psi\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-|q|}} \|a^*(\phi)\Psi\|_{\mathbf{1} \otimes P} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-|q|}} \|\phi\| \|\Psi\|.$$

$\square$

3.3.2. *Properties of Q_k .* Let $S \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H})$ and let ϕ be a unital vector perpendicular to $\mathcal{H}$. By lemma 2.6 there exists an operator $S : \mathcal{H} \oplus \phi \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \oplus \phi$ which is an extension of $S : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$.

It is easy to see that for each $\Phi \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$ there exists an element of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$ denoted by $Q_k(S)\Phi$ such that

$$(21) \quad \phi \otimes_k [Q_k(S)\Phi] = (\Pi_{\phi} \otimes_k \mathbf{1})Sa^*(\phi)\Phi,$$

where Π_{ϕ} denotes the orthogonal projection on the subspace spanned by ϕ and $\Pi_{\phi} \otimes_k \mathbf{1}$ is an operator, which on tensor products of not more than k vectors acts as $\mathbf{0}$ and on longer tensor powers acts on the $(k+1)$ -th factor by Π_{ϕ} .

Of course $Q_k(S) : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ is a linear operator. We shall prove that $Q_k(S)$ is an element of the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H})$ and that this operator in the normal ordering has exactly k creation operators, i.e. $Q_k(S) \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(k, \cdot)}(\mathcal{H})$.

Indeed, if S is in the following form

$$S = a^*(\phi_1) \cdots a^*(\phi_i) \lambda_{\nu_1}(T_1) \cdots \lambda_{\nu_l}(T_l) \gamma_{\mu} a(\psi_1) \cdots a(\psi_j)$$

then a simple computation shows that

$$Q_k(S) = \begin{cases} q^j \nu_1 \cdots \nu_l \mu S & : k = i \\ 0 & : k \neq i \end{cases},$$

and therefore $Q_k(S) \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(k, \cdot)}_{\text{fin}}(\mathcal{H})$.

The general statement follows from the fact that $Q_k : \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H})$ is a continuous map:

$$(22) \quad \|Q_k(S)\Psi\| = \|\phi \otimes_k [Q_k(S)\Psi]\|_{\mathbf{1} \otimes_k P} = \|[\Pi_{\phi} \otimes_k \mathbf{1}]Sa^*(\phi)\Psi\|_{\mathbf{1} \otimes_k P} \leq \\ \leq \|Sa^*(\phi)\Psi\|_{\mathbf{1} \otimes_k P} \leq \sqrt{d_{k,q}} \|Sa^*(\phi)\Psi\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{d_{k,q}}{1-|q|}} \|S\| \|\Psi\|.$$

In the following we shall often use the notation $Q_k : \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{H})$ defined on simple tensors by $Q_k(P \otimes R) = Q_k(P)R$.

3.3.3. *Norm of an integral with respect to the creation and annihilation processes.*

Theorem 3.3. *If $R : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ is a simple left-adapted biprocess then*

$$\left\| \int R(t) \sharp dA^*(t) \Psi \right\| \leq \sum_k \left(c_{k,q} \int \|Q_k[R(t)]\Psi\|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. Let $R(t) = \sum_i B_i \chi_{I_i}(t)$ where I_i are disjoint intervals. Since R is left-adapted for any $\Psi \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$ we have

$$\sum_i B_i \sharp a^*(\chi_{I_i}) \Psi = \sum_k \sum_i \chi_{I_i} \otimes_k [Q_k(B_i)\Psi],$$

therefore

$$\left\| \sum_i B_i \sharp a^*(\chi_{I_i}) \Psi \right\| \leq \sum_k \left\| \sum_i \chi_{I_i} \otimes_k [Q_k(B_i)\Psi] \right\|, \\ \left\| \sum_i \chi_{I_i} \otimes_k [Q_k(B_i)\Psi] \right\|^2 \leq c_{k,q} \left\| \sum_i \chi_{I_i} \otimes_k [Q_k(B_i)\Psi] \right\|_{\mathbf{1} \otimes_k P}^2 = \\ = c_{k,q} \sum_i \|Q_k(B_i)\Psi\|^2 \|\chi_{I_i}\|^2 = c_{k,q} \int \|Q_k[R(t)]\Psi\|^2 dt$$

what proves claimed theorem. $\square$

Now we shall define appropriate seminorms on the space of biprocesses:

$$\|R\|_{A^*} = \sum_k \left(c_{k,q} \int_0^\infty \|Q_k[R(t)]\|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$\|R\|_A = \|R^*\|_{A^*}.$$

Theorem 3.4. *Simple adapted (respectively left-adapted or right-adapted) biprocesses are dense in the space of adapted (respectively left-adapted or right-adapted) biprocesses in seminorms $\|\cdot\|_A$ and $\|\cdot\|_{A^*}$.*

Proof. Proof of an analogue fact can be found in the paper of Biane and Speicher [BiS]. $\square$

Therefore we can define an integral with respect to the creation (or annihilation) process of a left-adapted (or resp. right-adapted) biprocess $R(t)$ with finite seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{A^*}$ (or $\|\cdot\|_A$) as a limit of integrals of a sequence of simple biprocesses.

We have the following

Theorem 3.5. *If $R : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ is a left-adapted biprocess and $\Psi \in \Gamma$ then*

$$\left\| \int R(t) \sharp dA^*(t) \right\| \leq \|R\|_{A^*},$$

$$\left\| \int R(t) \sharp dA^*(t) \Psi \right\| \leq \sum_k \left(c_{k,q} \int \|Q_k[R(t)]\Psi\|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

If $R : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ is a right-adapted biprocess then

$$\left\| \int R(t) \sharp dA(t) \right\| \leq \|R\|_A.$$

3.4. Stochastic integral with respect to the gauge process. For an operator $S : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ and $\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}$ subspaces of Γ , we shall denote by $\|S\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}}$ the operator norm of S defined as

$$\|S\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}} = \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{V}, \|\Phi\|=1} \sup_{\Psi \in \mathcal{W}, \|\Psi\|=1} |\langle \Phi, S\Psi \rangle|.$$

For $|\mu| < 1$ introduce a gauge seminorm of a bioperator $B \in \mathcal{A}_t \otimes \mathcal{A}_t$

$$\|B\|_{\lambda_\mu} = \sup_{n,m \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{nm} \|B \sharp \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{(t,\infty)})\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes m}}$$

and if a biprocess R is adapted we introduce its gauge seminorm as

$$\|R\|_{\Lambda_\mu} = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \sup_{n,m \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{nm} \|R(t) \sharp \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{(t,\infty)})\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes m}}.$$

Theorem 3.6. *If $R(t)$ is a simple adapted biprocess then the following estimation holds:*

$$\left\| \int R(t) \sharp d\Lambda_\mu(t) \right\| \leq \|R\|_{\Lambda_\mu}.$$

As we shall see soon the assumption that R is simple can be omitted.

Proof. Let us consider a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ such that there exists an operator $U : \mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ which restricted to $\mathcal{H}$ is a unitary operator $U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ and restricted to $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is equal to $\mathbf{0}$. We introduce a process $\tilde{\Lambda}_\mu(t) = \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{\widetilde{(0,t)}})$, where $\Pi_{\tilde{I}}$ denotes the orthogonal projection on the subspace $U[\mathcal{L}^2(I)]$ for a set $I \subset \mathbb{R}_+$.

For any operator $X : \mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ we define $\lambda(X) = \lambda_1(X)$. Of course this operator is not bounded and therefore any manipulations with it have to be done carefully. Lemma 2.3 ensures that $\lambda(U)$ on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ is bounded and its norm equals to $\sqrt{n}$.

Let $\Gamma_{\mathcal{H}} \ni \Psi = \sum \Psi_n$, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{H}} \ni \Phi = \sum \Phi_n$, where $\Psi_n, \Phi_n \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$. For any measurable set M we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left\langle \Phi_n, \int_M R(t) \# d\Lambda_\mu(t) \Psi_m \right\rangle \right| = \\ & = \left| \left\langle \lambda(U)\Phi_n, \left(\int R(t) \# d\tilde{\Lambda}_\mu(t) \right) \lambda(U\Pi_M)\Psi_m \right\rangle \right| \leq \\ & \leq \sqrt{n} \|\Phi_n\| \|\lambda(U\Pi_M)\Psi_m\| \left\| \int R(t) \# d\tilde{\Lambda}_\mu(t) \right\|_{\lambda(U)[\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m}] \rightarrow \lambda(U)[\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}]} . \end{aligned}$$

Let $R(t) = \sum_i B_i \chi_{I_i}(t)$ where I_i are disjoint intervals. For different values of i operators $B_i \# \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{\tilde{I}_i}) : \lambda(U)\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m} \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}})$ have mutually orthogonal images and cokernels.

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_i B_i \# \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{\tilde{I}_i}) \right\|_{\lambda(U)\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m} \rightarrow \lambda(U)\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}} = \\ & = \max_i \left\| B_i \# \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{\widetilde{(t_i, \infty)}}) \right\|_{\lambda(U)\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m} \rightarrow \lambda(U)\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}} \leq \\ & \leq \max_i \left\| B_i \# \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{\widetilde{(t_i, \infty)}}) \right\|_{(\mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}})^{\otimes m} \rightarrow (\mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}})^{\otimes n}} = \\ & = \max_i \left\| B_i \# \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{(t_i, \infty)}) \right\|_{(\mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}})^{\otimes m} \rightarrow (\mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}})^{\otimes n}} = \\ & = \max_i \left\| B_i \# \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{(t_i, \infty)}) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}} , \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used the lemma 2.3 and in the last but one equality we used that second quantization $\Gamma(U + U^*) : \Gamma(\mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}})$ of unitary operator $U + U^*$ defined as

$$\Gamma(U + U^*)(\phi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \phi_n) = (U + U^*)(\phi_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes (U + U^*)(\phi_n)$$

is again unitary and

$$B_i \# \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{\mathcal{L}^2(t_i, \infty)}) = \Gamma(U + U^*)[B_i \# \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{\widetilde{(t_i, \infty)}})]\Gamma(U + U^*).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (23) \quad & \left| \left\langle \Phi, \int_M R(t) \# d\Lambda_\mu(t) \Psi \right\rangle \right| \leq \\ & \sum_{n,m} \|\Phi_n\| \|\lambda(U\Pi_M)\Psi_m\| \sqrt{n} \sup_i \left\| B_i \# \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{I_i}) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}} \leq \\ & \leq \sum_{n,m} \|\Psi_n\| \|\Phi_m\| \sqrt{nm} \sup_i \left\| B_i \# \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{I_i}) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}} \leq \|\Psi\| \|\Phi\| \|R\|_{\Lambda_\mu} . \end{aligned}$$

□

We would like to extend the definition of a stochastic integral with respect to the gauge process to all biprocesses with finite seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{\Lambda_\mu}$ by taking the limit. However, since this seminorm is of $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ type, the space of simple biprocess is not dense in this space. However, we may have the pointwise convergence.

Theorem 3.7. *For each adapted biprocess $R(t)$, $\|R\|_{\Lambda_\mu} < \infty$ there exists a sequence of simple adapted biprocesses R_i , $\|R_i\|_{\Lambda_\mu} \leq \|R\|_{\Lambda_\mu}$ such that $R_i(t) \rightarrow R(t)$ (convergence in the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{\lambda_\mu}$) for almost all t .*

Proof of this theorem follows the well-known proofs in the classical theory of stochastic integration and we shall omit it.

Theorem 3.8. *If (R_i) is a sequence of simple adapted biprocesses such that $\sup_i \|R_i\|_{\Lambda_\mu} < \infty$ and sequence $R_i(t)$ converges to some $R(t)$ in the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{\lambda_\mu}$ then the sequence $\int R_i \# d\Lambda_\mu(t)$ converges in the strong operator topology.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that for each $\epsilon > 0$ and all vectors $\Psi \in \Gamma$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{i,j > N} \|[R_i - R_j] \# d\Lambda_\mu(t) \Psi\| \leq \epsilon.$$

Let $M_{ij} = \{t : \|R_i(t) - R_j(t)\|_{\lambda_\mu} > \epsilon/2\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int [R_i(t) - R_j(t)] \# d\Lambda_\mu(t) = \\ (24) \quad & = \int_{M_{ij}} [R_i(t) - R_j(t)] \# d\Lambda_\mu(t) + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+ \setminus M_{ij}} [R_i(t) - R_j(t)] \# d\Lambda_\mu(t) \end{aligned}$$

and the operator norm of the second summand does not exceed $\epsilon/2$.

We shall use the notation introduced in proof of the theorem 3.6. It follows from the fact that $\bigcap_N \bigcup_{i,j > N} M_{ij}$ has measure 0 that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{i,j > N} \|\lambda(U\Pi_{M_{ij}})\Psi_m\| = 0$$

for any fixed vector $\Psi \in \Gamma$.

If we rewrite the inequality (23) replacing M by M_{ij} and $R(t)$ by $R_i(t) - R_j(t)$ we see by majorized convergence theorem that the first summand in (24) tends strongly to $\mathbf{0}$. $\square$

The preceding theorems allow us to extend the definition of an integral with respect to the gauge process to all adapted processes with finite norm $\|\cdot\|_{\Lambda_\mu}$ and to remove from the formulation of the theorem 3.6 the assumption that the integrand is simple.

3.5. Integrals with respect to time. For a biprocess R we introduce its seminorm

$$\|R\|_T = \int_0^\infty \|R \# \mathbf{1}\| dt.$$

Of course we have

$$\left\| \int R \# dT(t) \right\| \leq \|R\|_T.$$

4. ITERATED INTEGRALS

Lemma 4.1. *If $R : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ is a biprocess such that there exists an integer number j such that $R : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \bigoplus_{|i| \leq j} \mathcal{A}^{[i]}$ then for any process $S : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ we have*

$$\|RS\|_{\Lambda_\mu}, \|SR\|_{\Lambda_\mu} \leq \sqrt{j+1} (2j+1) \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \|S(t)\| \|R\|_{\Lambda_\mu}$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \|SR\|_{\Lambda_\mu} &\leq \sum_{|i| \leq j} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \sup_{n, m} \sqrt{nm} \left\| S(t)^{[i]} R(t) \sharp_{\Lambda_\mu} (\Pi_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes m}} \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{|i| \leq j} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \sup_{n, m} \sqrt{\frac{m}{m-i}} \sqrt{n(m-i)} \left\| S(t)^{[i]} \right\| \left\| R(t) \sharp_{\Lambda_\mu} (\Pi_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(m-i)}} \leq \\ &\leq \sqrt{j+1} (2j+1) \|S\| \|R\|_{\Lambda_\mu} \end{aligned}$$

because $m-i \geq 1$ and $\frac{m}{m-i} \leq j+1$. $\square$

Lemma 4.2. *For any biprocess $R(t)$, process $S(t)$ and $\Psi \in \Gamma$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|RS\|_{A^*} &\leq \|R\|_{A^*} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \|S(t)\| \\ \left\| \int R(t) S(t) \sharp dA^*(t) \Psi \right\| &\leq \|R\|_{A^*} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \|S(t) \Psi\| \end{aligned}$$

Proof. It is enough to notice that $Q_k[R(t)S(t)] = Q_k[R(t)]S(t)$ and recall the definition of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{A^*}$ and theorem 3.5 $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a constant $C_{n,q}$ such that if $R(t)$ is a biprocess such that $R(t) \in \bigoplus_{i \leq n} \mathcal{A}^{(i, \cdot)} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ and $S(t)$ is a process such that $S(t) \in \bigoplus_{i \leq n} \mathcal{A}^{(i, \cdot)}$, then*

$$\|SR\|_{A^*} \leq C_{n,q} \|R\|_{A^*} \sup_t \|S(t)\|.$$

If R is a biprocess such that $R(t) \in \bigoplus_{i \leq n} \mathcal{A}^{(i, \cdot)}$ and a sequence of processes $S_i(t)$ converges strongly to $\mathbf{0}$ and fulfills $S_i(t) \in \bigoplus_{i \leq n} \mathcal{A}^{(i, \cdot)}$ and $\sup_i \sup_t \|S_i(t)\| < \infty$ then integrals $\int S_i(t) R(t) \sharp dA^(t)$ converge strongly to $\mathbf{0}$ as well.*

Proof. For a unital vector ψ orthogonal to $\mathcal{H}$ we have (see inequality (22))

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_k[S(t)R(t)]\Psi\| &\leq \sqrt{d_{k,q}} \|S(t)R(t) \sharp a^*(\phi)\Psi\| \\ \|R(t) \sharp a^*(\phi)\Psi\| &= \left\| \sum_{l \leq n} \phi \otimes_l Q_l[R(t)]\Psi \right\| \leq \sum_{l \leq n} \sqrt{c_{l,q}} \|Q_l[R(t)]\| \|\Psi\| \end{aligned}$$

and therefore for some constants C_1, C_2, C_3 which depend only on q and n we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_k[S(t)R(t)]\| &\leq C_1 \|S(t)\| \sum_{l \leq n} \|Q_l[R(t)]\| \\ \|Q_k[S(t)R(t)]\|^2 &\leq C_2 \|S(t)\|^2 \sum_{l \leq n} \|Q_l[R(t)]\|^2 \\ \|SR\|_{A^*} &= \sum_{k \leq 2n} \left(c_{k,q} \int \|Q_k[S(t)R(t)]\|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C_3 \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \|S(t)\| \left(\sum_{l \leq n} \int \|Q_l[R(t)]\|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The second part of the lemma follows from the majorized convergence theorem. $\square$

Theorem 4.4. *If*

1. $\tau_n : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a sequence of measurable functions, $0 \leq \tau_n(t) \leq t$ and functions $\tau_n(t)$ tend to t uniformly,
2. S_1, S_2 are processes, $S_1 \in \{A^*, A, \Lambda_\mu, T\}$, $S_2 \in \{A^*, A, \Lambda_\nu, T\}$
3. $R_1, R_2 : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ are adapted biprocesses and their appropriate norms of are finite: $\|R_1\|_{S_1}, \|R_2\|_{S_2} < \infty$,
4. if $S_1 = \Lambda_\mu$ then there exists j such that for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have $\int_0^t R_2 \# dS_2 \in \bigoplus_{|i| \leq j} \mathcal{A}^{[i]}$
5. if $S_1 = A$ then there exists j such that for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have $R_1(t) \in \bigoplus_{i \leq j} A \otimes \mathcal{A}^{(\cdot, i)}$ and $\int_0^t R_2 \# dS_2 \in \bigoplus_{i \leq j} \mathcal{A}^{(\cdot, i)}$
6. if $S_2 = \Lambda_\nu$ then there exists j such that for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have $\int_0^t R_1 \# dS_1 \in \bigoplus_{|i| \leq j} \mathcal{A}^{[i]}$
7. if $S_2 = A^*$ then there exists j such that for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have $R_2(t) \in \bigoplus_{i \leq j} \mathcal{A}^{(i, \cdot)} \otimes A$ and $\int_0^t R_1 \# dS_1 \in \bigoplus_{i \leq j} \mathcal{A}^{(i, \cdot)}$

then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty R_1(t) \left[\int_0^t R_2(s) \# dS_2(s) \right] \# dS_1(t) = \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty R_1(t) \left[\int_0^{\tau_n(t)} R_2(s) \# dS_2(s) \right] \# dS_1(t), \\ & \int_0^\infty \left[\int_0^s R_1(t) \# dS_1(t) \right] R_2(s) \# dS_2(s) = \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty \left[\int_0^{\tau_n(s)} R_1(t) \# dS_1(t) \right] R_2(s) \# dS_2(s). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $S_2 \neq \Lambda_\nu$ functions $\left\| \int_{\tau_n(t)}^t R_2 \# dS_2(s) \right\|$ uniformly tend to 0. Therefore by preceding lemmas appropriate norms of biprocesses $R_1(t) \left[\int_{\tau_n(t)}^t R_2(s) \# dS_2(s) \right]$ tend to 0 what proves that the limit in the first equation holds in the operator norm.

For $S_2 = \Lambda_\nu$ and $S_1 \in \{T, A^*\}$ for each $\Psi \in \Gamma$ functions $\left\| \int_{\tau_n(t)}^t R_2(s) \# dS_2(s) \Psi \right\|$ by theorem 3.8 uniformly tend to 0 and theorem 3.5 shows that the limit in the first equation holds in the strong operator topology.

For $S_1 = \Lambda_\mu$ and $S_2 = A^*$ lemma 4.3 and theorem 3.8 assure that the limit in the second equation holds in the strong operator topology.

For $S_1 = \Lambda_\mu$, $S_2 = \Lambda_\nu$ we introduce a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \oplus \hat{\mathcal{H}}$ such that there exist operators U, V which restricted to $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} \oplus \hat{\mathcal{H}}$ are equal to 0 and which map isometrically $\mathcal{H}$ respectively onto $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$. In the following for $I \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ $\Pi_{\tilde{I}}$ and $\Pi_{\hat{I}}$ will denote the orthogonal projection respectively onto $U[\mathcal{L}^2(I)]$ and $V[\mathcal{L}^2(I)]$, furthermore $\widetilde{\Lambda}_\mu(t) = \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{\widetilde{(0,t)}})$ and $\widehat{\Lambda}_\mu(t) = \lambda_\mu(\Pi_{\widehat{(0,t)}})$.

We have

$$(25) \quad \int_0^\infty \left[\int_{\tau_n(s)}^s R_1(t) \sharp d\Lambda_\mu(t) \right] R_2(s) \sharp d\Lambda_\nu(s) = \\ = \lambda(V^*) \lambda(U^*) \left[\int_0^\infty R_1(t) \sharp d\widehat{\Lambda}_\mu(t) \right] \int_0^\infty \lambda(U \Pi_{(\tau_n(s), s)}) R_2(s) \sharp d\widehat{\Lambda}_\nu(s) \lambda(V).$$

Note that even though $\lambda(U)$, $\lambda(V)$ are unbounded operators, the right-hand side of this equation is well defined on domain $\Gamma(\mathcal{H})$ (see proof of theorem 3.6).

For each n we consider a sequence $t_{n,k} = k/n$ and a bounded operator $\Xi_n : \lambda(U)\lambda(V)\Gamma(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \lambda(U)\lambda(V)\Gamma(\mathcal{H})$ defined as

$$\Xi_n = \sum_i \lambda(\Pi_{(\widetilde{u_{n,i}, t_{n,i+1}})}) \lambda(\Pi_{(\widetilde{t_{n,i}, t_{n,i+1}})})$$

where $u_{n,i} = \inf_{x \in (t_{n,i}, t_{n,i+1})} \tau_n(x)$. It is easy to see that the sequence (Ξ_n) strongly tends to $\mathbf{0}$ and since

$$\int_0^\infty \lambda(\Pi_{(\widetilde{\tau_n(s), s})}) U R_2(s) \sharp d\widehat{\Lambda}_\nu(s) \lambda(V) = \\ = \Xi_n \int_0^\infty \lambda(\Pi_{(\widetilde{\tau_n(s), s})}) U R_2(s) \sharp d\widehat{\Lambda}_\nu(s) \lambda(V)$$

then the expression (25) strongly tends to $\mathbf{0}$, what proves the first equation.

All the other cases we obtain by taking adjoint of considered cases. $\square$

5. ITÔ'S FORMULA

5.1. Properties of P_0 . We introduce a map $P_0 : \mathcal{A}_K(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_K(\mathcal{H})$ as follows. Let ϕ be a unital vector perpendicular to $\mathcal{H}$. $P_0(R)$ is an operator defined by

$$P_0(R)\Psi = a(\phi)Ra^*(\phi)\Psi,$$

for all $\Psi \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$. It is easy to see that for

$$R = a^*(\phi_1) \cdots a^*(\phi_i) \lambda_{\nu_1}(T_1) \cdots \lambda_{\nu_l}(T_l) \gamma_\mu a(\psi_1) \cdots a(\psi_j),$$

we have

$$P_0(R) = q^{i+j} \nu_1 \cdots \nu_l \mu R,$$

and therefore $P_0(R) \in \mathcal{A}_K(\mathcal{H})$.

5.2. Itô formula.

Theorem 5.1. *If assumptions 2–7 of theorem 4.4 are fulfilled then*

$$(26) \quad \left[\int R_1(s) \sharp dS_1(s) \right] \left[\int R_2(t) \sharp dS_2(t) \right] = \int [R_1(u) \sharp dS_1(u)] [R_2(u) \sharp dS_2(u)] + \\ + \int R_1(s) \left[\int_0^s R_2(t) \sharp dS_2(t) \right] \sharp dS_1(s) + \int \left[\int_0^t R_1(s) \sharp dS_1(s) \right] R_2(t) \sharp dS_2(t),$$

where the first summand on the right hand side is defined as follows:

$$(27) \quad \int [R_1(u) \sharp dA(u)] [R_2(u) \sharp dA^*(u)] = \int (\mathbf{1} \otimes P_0 \otimes \mathbf{1})(R_1(u) R_2(u)) du,$$

$$(28) \quad \int [R_1(u) \sharp d\Lambda_\mu(u)] [R_2(u) \sharp dA^*(u)] = \int [R_1(u) \sharp \gamma_\mu] R_2(u) \sharp dA^*(u),$$

$$(29) \quad \int [R_1(u) \sharp dA(u)] [R_2(u) \sharp d\Lambda_\nu(u)] = \int [R_1(u) [R_2(u) \sharp \gamma_\nu]] \sharp dA(u),$$

$$(30) \quad \int [R_1(u) \sharp d\Lambda_\mu(u)] [R_2(u) \sharp d\Lambda_\nu(u)] = \int [R_1(u) \sharp \mathbf{1}] R_2(u) \sharp d\Lambda_{\mu\nu}(u),$$

$$(31) \quad \int [R_1(u) \sharp dS_1(u)] [R_2(u) \sharp dS_2(u)] = 0 \quad \text{for other values of } S_1, S_2.$$

Informally we may write it as follows:

		dS_2			
		dA	dA^*	$d\Lambda_\nu$	dT
dS_1	dA	0	dT	$dA\gamma_\nu$	0
	dA^*	0	0	0	0
	$d\Lambda_\mu$	0	$\gamma_\mu dA^*$	$d\Lambda_{\mu\nu}$	0
	dT	0	0	0	0

Proof. For $n = 1, 2$ let $R_n = \sum R_{ni} \chi_{I_i}$ be simple adapted biprocesses. We assume that intervals (I_i) form a partition, i.e. that they are disjoint. Note that we can replace partition (I_i) by a refined partition $(I_i^{(\epsilon)})$ so that $\max_i |I_i^{(\epsilon)}| < \epsilon$.

$$(32) \quad \left[\int R_1(s) \sharp dS_1(s) \right] \left[\int R_2(t) \sharp dS_2(t) \right] =$$

$$(33) \quad = \sum_i [R_{1i} \sharp S_1(I_i)] [R_{2i} \sharp S_2(I_i)] +$$

$$(34) \quad + \sum_j \sum_{i < j} [R_{1i} \sharp S_1(I_i)] [R_{2j} \sharp S_2(I_j)] + \sum_i \sum_{j < i} [R_{1i} \sharp S_1(I_i)] [R_{2j} \sharp S_2(I_j)]$$

The second and the third summands tend by theorem 4.4 to the second and the third summands of the right hand side of (26). We shall find the weak limit of the first summand when the grid of the partition tends to 0.

If $S_1 = T$ or $S_2 = T$ then it is easy to see that the term (33) tends strongly to $\mathbf{0}$.

If $S_1 = A^*$ theorem 3.5 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_i [R_{1i} \sharp a^*(I_i)] [R_{2i} \sharp S_2(I_i)] \Psi \right\| \leq \\ & \leq \sum_k \left(c_{k,q} \sum_i \|Q_k(R_{1i}) [R_{2i} \sharp S_2(I_i)] \Psi\|^2 |I_i| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \\ & = \|R_1\|_{A^*} \sup_i \|R_{2i} \sharp S_2(I_i) \Psi\|, \end{aligned}$$

what tends to 0 as the grid of the partition (I_i) tends to 0.

By taking the adjoint we see that if $S_2 = A$ then the term (33) weakly tends to 0 as the grid of the partition (I_i) tends to 0.

The cases we have already considered show that the equation (31) holds.

If $S_1 = A$ and $S_2 = A^*$ then we can split the normally ordered form of the expression $[R_{1i} \sharp a(I_i)] [R_{2i} \sharp a^*(I_i)]$ into two parts: the first which does not contain operators $a^*(I_i)$, $a(I_i)$ and is equal to $|I_i|(\mathbf{1} \otimes P_0 \otimes \mathbf{1}) [R_{1i} R_{2i}]$ and the second, which contains these operators in this order. The sum over i of the second part tends in

operator norm to 0 as the grid of the partition tend to 0 because it is in form (33) for $S_1 = A^*$ and $S_2 = A$, what proves equation (27).

If $S_1 = \Lambda_\mu$ and $S_2 = A^*$ then we can split the normally ordered form of the expression $[R_{1i} \sharp \lambda_\mu(I_i)][R_{2i} \sharp a^*(I_i)]$ into two parts: one equal to $[R_{1i} \sharp \gamma_\mu][R_{2i} \sharp a^*(I_i)]$ and the second part which contains operators $a^*(I_i)$, $\lambda_\mu(I_i)$ in this order. The sum over i of the second part is in the form (33) with $S_1 = A^*$ and $S_2 = \Lambda_\mu$ therefore tends strongly to 0 as the grid of partition tends to 0, what proves equation (28).

By taking the adjoint of (28) we obtain the equation (29), i.e. the case $S_1 = A$, $S_2 = \Lambda_\nu$.

If $S_1 = \Lambda_\mu$, $S_2 = \Lambda_\nu$ we introduce a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \oplus \hat{\mathcal{H}}$ such that there exist operators U , V which restricted to $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} \oplus \hat{\mathcal{H}}$ are equal to 0 and which map isometrically $\mathcal{H}$ respectively onto $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \Psi, \sum_i [R_{1i} \sharp \lambda_\mu(I_i)][R_{2i} \sharp \lambda_\nu(I_i)] \Phi \right\rangle = \\ & = \left\langle \Psi, \lambda(U^*) \lambda(V^*) \left[\int R_1(t) \sharp d\tilde{\Lambda}_\mu(t) \right] \left[\int R_2(s) d\hat{\Lambda}_\nu(s) \right] \times \right. \\ & \times \left. \left[\sum_k \lambda(U \Pi_{I_k}) \lambda(V \Pi_{I_k}) \right] \Phi \right\rangle + \left\langle \Psi, \sum_i [R_{1i} \sharp \gamma_\mu][R_{2i} \sharp \lambda_\nu(\Pi_{I_i})] \Phi \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that as the grid of the partition (I_i) tends to 0 that the operators $\sum_k \lambda(U \Pi_{I_k}) \lambda(V \Pi_{I_k})$ strongly tend to 0, therefore the first summand strongly tends to 0, what proves (30).

Now it is enough to notice that any biprocesses can be approximated by simple biprocesses. $\square$

Particularly, we can obtain a Itô formula for noncommutative Brownian motion: $B(t) = A(t) + A^*(t)$ and Poisson process with intensively l and deformation parameter μ : $P_{\mu,l}(t) = \sqrt{l}(\gamma_\mu A(t) + A^*(t)\gamma_\mu) + \frac{\Lambda(t)}{\mu} + lt\gamma_\mu$

		dS_2					dS_2		
			dt	$dB(t)$				dt	$dP_{\nu,l}(t)$
dS_1	dt	0	0		dS_1	dt	0	0	
	$dB(t)$	0	dt			$dP_{\mu,l}(t)$	0	$dP_{\mu\nu,l}(t)$	

6. FINAL REMARKS

In this paper we have presented foundations of q -deformed stochastic calculus. The lack of space does not allow us to present its applications, among them the connection between q -deformed stochastic integral and noncommutative local martingales. Especially interesting is the possibility of interpolation of classical Brownian motion and Poisson process by their bounded q -deformed analogues for $q \rightarrow 1$ where new tools are useful. There are also many questions concerning deformed Poisson process.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank prof. Marek Bożejko for many inspiring discussions. This work was partially supported by the Scientific Research Committee in Warsaw under grant number P03A05415.

REFERENCES

- [BiS] P.Biane, R.Speicher, Stochastic calculus with respect to free Brownian motion and analysis on Wigner space. Preprint 1997, *Prob. Th. Rel. Fields* (in printing)
- [Boż] M.Bożejko, Completely positive maps on Coxeter groups and the ultracontractivity of the q -Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup, *Banach Center Publications* **43**, 87-93 (1998)
- [BS1] M.Bożejko, R.Speicher, Completely positive maps on Coxeter, deformed commutation relations, and operator spaces, *Math. Ann.* **300**, 97-120 (1994)
- [BS2] M.Bożejko, R.Speicher, An example of a generalized Brownian motion II, *Quantum Probability and Related Topics VII*, ed. L.Accardi, Singapore, World Scientific 1992, pp. 219-236
- [BSW1] B.Barnett, R.F.Streater, I.F.Wilde, The Itô-Clifford integral, *J. Funct. Anal.* **48**, 172-212 (1982)
- [BSW2] B.Barnett, R.F.Streater, I.F.Wilde, Quasi-free quantum stochastic integrals for the CAR and CCR, *J. Funct. Anal.* **52**, 19-47 (1983)
- [FB] U.Frisch, R.Bourret, Parastochastics, *J. Math. Phys.* **11**, 364-390 (1970)
- [HuP] R.L.Hudson, K.R.Parthasarathy, Quantum Itô's formula and stochastic evolution, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **93** 1994, 301-323
- [KüS] B.Kümmerer, R.Speicher, Stochastic integration on the Cuntz algebra O_∞ , *J. Funct. Anal.* **103**, 372-408 (1992)
- [Spe] R.Speicher, Stochastic Integration on the Full Fock Space with the Help of a Kernel Calculus, Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University, **27**, No. 1 (1991)

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS,, UNIVERSITY OF WROCLAW,, PL. GRUNWALDZKI 2/4, 50-384 WROCLAW, POLAND

E-mail address: psnia@math.uni.wroc.pl